

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/594001/P12805
Intel Corporation

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The paragraph beginning at page 3, line 21 of the specification has been amended to correct the reference to refer to private network 30.

35 USC § 112

Claim 19 has been amended to recite "wherein determining an application layer access control list entry", a feature which has antecedent basis in claim 12.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19, and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rodwin in view of Fan and Srisuresh. Claims 9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rodwin in view of Fan, Srisuresh, and Barkley. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/594001/P12805
Intel Corporation

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "determining a private network address for a user in connection with the user accessing a network resource on a network; determining an application layer access control list entry for the user based on an access control policy; generating a network layer access control list entry for the user based on the determined private network address; sending the determined application layer access control list entry to nodes on the network that do not support network layer packet filtering; sending the generated network layer access control list entry to nodes on the network that support network layer packet filtering; translating a public network address to the private network address for the user accessing the network resource; and allowing or blocking the user access to the network resource based on at least one of the application access layer control list entry and the network layer access control list entry" (for support see, inter alia, specification page 3, line 21 to page 7, line 5). Claims 12 and 23 recite similar features.

The combination of the cited references fails to disclose or otherwise suggest a method as recited in claim 1. Fan describes an arrangement in which access lists may be modified to change packet filtering criteria (see, inter alia, Fan col. 7, lines 24-26). With this configuration, a firewall may

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/594001/P12805
Intel Corporation

maintain state information regarding sessions and additionally inspect each packet within a data flow to ensure that a state of a session and the packets comply with a security policy (see, inter alia, col. 7, lines 21-38). Fan relates to packet filtering at a firewall based on access lists (as opposed to application layer ACLs) and does not describe determining an application layer access control list entry for user based on an access control policy and sending the determined application layer access control list entry to nodes on the network that do not support network layer packet filtering. Even combining with the other references would not suggest an arrangement in which both application layer access control list entries are sent to nodes on the network that do not support network layer packet filtering and network layer access control list entries are sent to nodes on the network that support network layer packet filtering.

Accordingly, claims 1, 12, and 23 should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition,


Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/594001/P12805
Intel Corporation

because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/28/05



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10537322.doc